```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 97-cr-01005 - PKC
 4
5
            -against-
                                    : United States Courthouse
6
                                     Brooklyn, New York
7
                                     Tuesday, April 23, 2024
8
     JOHN PAPPA,
                                     10:00 a.m.
9
              Defendant.
10
11
            TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ORAL ARGUMENT
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA K. CHEN
12
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
                         APPEARANCES:
14
    For the Government: BREON S. PEACE, ESQ.
                           United States Attorney
                            Eastern District of New York
15
                              271 Cadman Plaza East
                              Brooklyn, New York 11201
16
                         BY: RAFFAELA BELIZAIRE, ESQ.
17
                             Assistant United States Attorney
18
    For the Defendant:
                          HOPWOOD & SINGHAL PLLC
                                1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
19
                                Suite 200
                               Washington, D.C. 20006
20
                                SHON HOPWOOD, ESQ.
                           BY:
                               KYLE SINGHAL, ESQ.
21
22
                     Nicole J. Sesta, RMR, CRR, RPR
    Court Reporter:
                     Official Court Reporter
                     E-mail: NSestaRMR@gmail.com
23
24
    Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript
    produced by Computer-aided Transcription.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## **Proceedings**

2

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal cause for oral argument, United States versus Pappa, docket number 97-cr-1005. Will the parties please state their appearances for the record, starting with the government.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Good morning, Your Honor.

Raffaela Belizaire for the government. Also at counsel table with me is Special Agent Joseph Costello.

> THE COURT: Good morning to both of you.

MR. HOPWOOD: Good morning, Your Honor.

Shon Hopwood and my colleague, Kyle Singhal, on behalf of John Pappa.

I'm sorry. What was your colleague's THE COURT: name?

> MR. HOPWOOD: Kyle Singhal.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you. You may remain seated during this proceeding so that you can use the microphones.

I just want to start off by making clear this is not a formal resentencing hearing. I am not going to sentence the defendant today or at this proceeding.

The purpose of today's proceeding is to give the parties an opportunity to be heard beyond their written submissions. I also want to give any victims or family members of victims the opportunity to be heard, as well as the defendant, if he wishes to be heard.

Let me ask the government, I have received letters from some family members of some of the victims. Is there any family member or any victim who wants to speak today?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor.

There are three individuals who would like to address the Court today regarding this motion. The first of them is Ms. Rosemary Sparacino, who is the mother of John Sparacino; the cousin of John Sparacino; the cousin of John Sparacino, Karen Bracco; and then the surviving intimate partner of Rolando Rivera, Ms. Gedz, who would also like to address the Court.

THE COURT: That's G-E-D-Z; is that correct?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How do you spell Bracco?

MS. BELIZAIRE: B-R-A-C-C-O.

THE COURT: Why don't we have those individuals speak first in case they decide they don't want to stay for the rest of this, and I don't want to detain them any longer than necessary. Obviously they have the right to stay as long as they want. Is there an order of people who want to speak?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Why don't we first call Ms. Rosemary Sparacino.

THE COURT: Ms. Sparacino, if you would come forward. This might be a little awkward but if you're all right standing here at this podium, I think that might be the

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

best.

Do you need to have a seat or is standing okay?

You can sit, if you like. Maybe sit next to the agent over there and use the microphone. It might be a little less awkward.

I know this is a little uncomfortable, but I'm going to have you first state your full name for the record, and then pull the microphone as close to you as possible.

MS. SPARACINO: Rosemary Sparacino.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Sparacino.

MS. SPARACINO: Good morning, Your Honor.

My eldest son was 24 years old when he was executed. The defendant savagely mutilated his body and placed him in a car, which he then set on fire. Such depraved indifference to human life shouldn't be rewarded with an early release. My family has received and will continue to endure life sentences without any chance of reprieve from this endless grief and senseless loss.

My grandchildren will never have an uncle. My youngest son will never have his brother back, and my heart and mind have never been -- have been irrevocably damaged by the defendant's cruel and barbaric actions. The defendant sat at my table on many occasions and was treated as a family member.

He actually looked me straight in the eye and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### **Proceedings**

expressed concern and confusion about my son's disappearance knowing full well the atrocities he committed; the location of his mutilated body.

Having received the sentence of life plus 45 years with no chance of parole, the defense is now seeking early release as an opportunity to reenter society. My son has no option.

The defendant's release would impact the entire family. My peace of mind would be shattered knowing that he was back in society and in the position to potentially threaten, hurt, and maim my only living son and grandchildren. I implore you to put a stop to this for early release. that you put yourself in my shoes only for a moment. defendant did your son or daughter what he did to mine, would you be inclined to set him free? I hate you.

Thank you very much, Ms. Sparacino. THE COURT: Ι am truly sorry for your loss.

> MS. BRACCO: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Please state your name for the record.

MS. BRACCO: My name is Karen Bracco, and John Sparacino was my cousin. I am writing to implore you to keep this murderer in prison. The man who murdered my cousin was charming and personable. He was also devious and cunning. He used these traits to keep himself close to my Aunt Rose and my cousin, Sal, knowing full well the atrocity he had committed.

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

# Proceedings

While our family searched for my cousin, John, his killer was in my aunt's house pretending to aid the search. When his body was found in a horrific state, his killer remained close to my cousin, Sal, never showing a moment of guilt or remorse over what he had done, only caring if any suspicion was on him. He sat at my aunt's table knowing the vicious and brutal way that he had killed her son.

He looked in her face and never showed a glimmer of conscience for what he had done. I suppose he used these traits to make somebody believe that he deserves leniency. But then that's what a sociopath would be good at doing, convincing people that they're someone that they're not so they can carry out some deprayed agenda.

In the three decades since John was murdered, it's hard to remember him separate from the circumstances of his death. I am haunted by the details of what so inhumanely was done to him. I force myself to remember the softness of his face, how incredibly blue his eyes were, or the slight lisp in his voice that always reminded me of the little boy he once was.

John could tell a story that would make you laugh harder than anyone. A simple trip to the grocery store would generate a story that would have you in tears. He was funny and he was loving. He was loved by his cousins, aunts, and uncles, and adored by his mother and his brother.

Nicole Sestá, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

His life has value and meaning and I miss him terribly. The day John was brutally murdered, his family received a life sentence that we will never get any relief from. There's not a second chance for John. After 30 years, there will be no trips to Disney, walks on the beaches, he'll never be able to share another holiday with us, dance at his nephew's wedding. He will not be there to hold his mother's hand when she's ill.

THE COURT: I need you to go a little slower because we have a court reporter.

MS. BRACCO: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: It's okay. Can you back up and, I apologize, you say after 30 years there will be no trips.

MS. BRACCO: There will be no trips to Disney for him or walks on the beach. He will never be able to share another holiday with us, dance at his nephew's wedding. He will not be there to hold his mother's hand when she is ill.

He will never experience the countless hopes and dreams we had for him. One person is responsible for the everlasting grief John's family suffers. To give this man a second chance is to allow a vicious and brutal murderer back into society. To give him the opportunity to experience all that he robbed John and his family of is undeserved. I also sincerely fear for the lives of my aunt and cousin, as this person is without conscience or remorse.

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# **Proceedings**

8

Neither of them deserves to live out the remainder of their lives wondering if they will run into him somewhere, or worse yet if he will seek retribution on them or their families. I implore you to keep this murderer where he is, to spend the remainder of his days praying for the savage and brutal thing that he did. Please don't be fooled by him as we I'm begging for justice for my cousin, John, and peace of mind for my aunt and my cousin. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'll hear now from Ms. Gedz.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. She's in the hallway and will be coming in in just a moment.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Gedz, if you'll come up here to the table where the prosecutor is sitting. You can have a seat there in the back, and I want you to be sure to use the microphone. And if you'll start off by stating your name for the record.

> MS. GEDZ: My name is Michele Gedz.

THE COURT: And that's G-E-D-Z, right?

MS. GEDZ: G-E-D-Z.

And common spelling of Michele? THE COURT:

MS. GEDZ: M-I-C-H-E-L-E.

THE COURT: You can make whatever statement you Just bear in mind, we have a court reporter who is transcribing everything. So just go slowly and take your

time. You may proceed.

MS. GEDZ: So I was going to come prepared and have everything written down, and I said, I'm going to wing it, just like what was thrown at me. So I'm going to do the best that I can.

THE COURT: Take your time.

MS. GEDZ: I was five months pregnant starting a life, expecting to have a life with someone that was my soulmate, the love of my life. Okay.

I had a child that never got to see, smell, hear, feel the love of the real father. Okay. My life was taken on that day, June 8, 1994. Okay. My life was taken. I was never the same and I'll never be the same.

Ripped from my life, taken out like trash, thrown on a highway, like garbage. Okay. Here one day, gone the next. I didn't cry. I went into shock. I spent my whole pregnancy messing up, walking alone, looking up at the stars saying how is this happening, how am I having a baby from a dead man that I had plans with. Okay.

After that, I couldn't hold my child. I couldn't love my child because she looks so much like her father, and I couldn't bring myself to let that love come out because I was afraid of losing another one because I felt in order for her to be here, he had to die. To give a life, they take a life.

So I had a child with her father ripped from her

## Proceedings

from the day she was born, from before, and I had to live a mental case for years and years and years with numerous breakdowns and rage and anger, replaying everything that was said to me that night, replaying it in my head over and over. How could I have saved him? Why did he go? Why?

Why couldn't I tell him that I didn't want him to go? What was making him go? Why? All these questions. Why? Why? But my biggest question is why am I here today? Why? The victims that have been left behind have been left to suffer all these years. Did I ever think I'd be here 30 years later? Did I think from 1994 that I would be sitting here facing you, which I've always dreamed of but knowing that I would never get an answer. Knowing. Okay.

You took people's lives and you have ruined us, ruined us that we can't see our loved ones. Our loved ones can never get a life. My child could never feel her father. My child could never see her father, smell him, nothing. You're young enough to have a life and your life should be behind bars. Okay. Like I have felt I've been in a mental prison for 30 fucking -- sorry.

THE COURT: That's all right.

MS. GEDZ: For 30 years I've been in a mental freaking prison filled with rage and anger that I have known where you've been every time you've been transferred. My dream was to come and sit, look at you in your eyes, but I

know I would never get an answer as to why. Why?

So compassionate release, reduced sentence, why?
Why? You deserve everything you freaking get. You don't even deserve to be in this courtroom. Okay. We don't need to be in this damn courtroom. I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's all right.

MS. GEDZ: You're looking to get a chance at life. What life have we had? I've had PTSD, afraid of people coming after me, being set up the day before I had to testify and you know who. Yeah, act like you don't know because I'm not even going to say it in the courtroom, okay, because there was a phone call made and I had to be taken somewhere. All right.

You took not only the people's lives but you took our lives because when we lost them, we lost ourselves and I have suffered because of you. My child has suffered because of you and I'm still suffering because of you, because when the hell are you going to go away and never be seen again? When? When? You don't deserve a chance for the things you've done and how you've done them. A leopard does not change its spots.

You're just upset that you can't freaking have freedom. And why should you have freedom because none of us had freedom. We've never been free of you, ever, ever. The only day we'll be free of you is when the good Lord says it's

time. Okay.

And it can't come too soon, I'm telling you, because this has been way too long and this has been way too long for me to look at you and say these things without having to watch what I say. You ripped lives apart. You've torn us apart. And you want compassion. Where was the compassion for us? Where was the compassion to the lives that you took?

Why should you get a reduced sentence? You know what your sentence should have been? It should have been the freaking death penalty. It should have been that because then it would have been an even thing. You shouldn't get to live a life. You're young enough to fucking -- sorry.

THE COURT: It's all right.

MS. GEDZ: You're young enough to go on with your life and have a family, if you don't already. Whatever. I don't know your life, I don't care to know your life. You shouldn't have one. Yours is behind bars. That's where you need to be. That's where you need to stay. There is no compassion, and if anybody in here thinks that you deserve compassion, they're just as freaking sick and evil as you are.

Because the apple don't fall far from the tree, and you know what I mean. So you wanted to be just like somebody, well, you did it. Okay. You did it. The only difference is is you're still here. No compassion. There is none, not from me, not from any other victim, not from the Rivera family, I'm

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Proceedings

sure not from Sal's family. And I'm so glad that you're here.

I thought I was going to be the only one.

You don't deserve after what you did to him, how you did it. What you did to me, not that you gave a shit about anybody but yourself to climb a ladder. That's all you wanted. There is no young and impressionable. There is no compassion for you. You didn't show us compassion, you fool. You deserve nothing. Nothing. Because let me tell Nothing. you, you're young enough, and I know, I know people like you come out after 27, 30 years and they go back because a lot of favors to be owed. Right? You think you're going to come out and live a freaking productive life. You're nothing but garbage. Garbage. Okay.

And what you did to those victims should only come back on you ten fuck -- excuse me, Your Honor -- tenfold.

Because I've waited for this day. Don't make like you're choking up. Get the hell out of here. You're a phony, you're a fake, you're a loser, and you're a killer, and that's all you'll ever be. Remember that. You've taken lives. You've gotten that taste. Don't act like you deserve anything from anybody. You deserve nothing but suffering like we've suffered. Just because we're out in the streets doesn't mean that we're fine. We hide our pain. We go on with our lives every day without the loved ones.

I don't know how my life would have turned out if he

## Proceedings

was with me. I probably would have had a better life. I've struggled. I've had freaking breakdowns, winded up in freaking institutions because of you.

My kid couldn't even get the proper love from me because of you. I was afraid to love her because I was afraid she'd be ripped out of my arms and gone. I was afraid, and I was afraid for years, and I never got help, which I should have, but I dealt with it on my own and I didn't do a good job.

You know what, I think maybe today, looking at your pitiful freaking face here wanting compassion that you're not going to get, and I pray to God, I pray that everybody up there just is all around us.

You get nothing. You finish out your four mandatory life sentences without the possibility of parole and you get no compassion, and you don't get to live a life out in the street and have a family and have a kid and make like you were not a bad guy or you're not evil. Evil does not die.

You are pure evil and you are the spawn of evil and there is nothing else you will ever be. So I would just say stay in prison because you get out, who are you? Who are you? How are you going to live? You're a piece of shit. I hope you rot for the rest of your natural born days.

I have suffered and suffered and suffered, and I want you to suffer the way I've suffered and the way he has

suffered and other families have suffered because of the likes of you.

You're nothing. I thought that coming here and having you see me cry was giving you power, but you know what, my tears have stopped because I'm looking at you and I see nothing because you are nothing and that's what you'll always be. Fucking garbage. Excuse me. You're trash. You're trash. That's all I have to say right now. With his pitiful face looking all worried. You should be worried because hopefully, hopefully, pray to God, that you don't get out. Because you deserve nothing and you'll always be that, evil and nothing. You have no power. I'm done.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Ms. Gedz. I'm very, very sorry for your loss.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Your Honor, I've been informed that John Sparacino's brother, Salvatore Sparacino, would also like to be heard.

THE COURT: Okay. For the court reporter, because I've seen it in the writings, but I want to make sure. It's an N before the C; is that right?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor, it's S-P-A-R-A-C-I-N-O.

THE COURT: Mr. Sparacino, if you'll start off by stating your name for the record and remember to use the microphone, and speak slowly enough for the court reporter.

Nicole Sesta, RPF, RMF, CRR Officia, Court Reporter

## Proceedings

MR. SPARACINO: Salvatore Sparacino. I'm John Sparacino's brother. I don't have anything really to say to the Court. I have something to say to you. You're the fucking biggest coward I ever met in my life. I got this image of you, you think you're a hunter, you put an apple down and you run and hide in the tree and camouflage yourself. You camouflaged yourself as my fucking friend, my family, and then you fucking wait and shoot in the back.

You have no balls. You're a fucking piece of shit and if God fucking has mercy and let's you out, I'll never fucking let this go. I will never let this go, ever. Send him home. Bring him home to me. You know what I could do to you because you're a pussy. Your whole fucking life, your whole life.

I will eat you alive. You know you ain't fucking nothing. You sneak behind people's backs, look them in the eye. Be a fucking man. Don't be a rat like your father was, like Sammy the Bull said it in his book. Your father was a rat. You must be here because either you're a rat or you're a piece of shit. I would kill you. Five fucking minutes alone with you, I would eat you alive and you know that. Let God have mercy on your soul. If you ever come home, there will be fucking repercussions. I promise you.

THE COURT: All right. Let's take a second here for everyone to calm down some. Thank you to the marshals.

Nicole Sestá, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

Those are all the family members who would like to speak; is that correct?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's do this now. I'd like to hear argument from the lawyers, in part so I think we can calm things down a bit and take the temperature down a bit.

Understandably, I think there are a lot of emotions that are running very high here and I just want to step back for a moment and hear from the lawyers.

I don't want you to repeat everything in your submissions. You should trust that I have read them, but I would like you to highlight those things you think are most important for me to consider and focus on and then there will be some questions I might ask you, so I might interrupt you.

In particular, there's a question I do want to ask the government, but I'm going to let the defense go first.

Bear in mind I'm going to ask you about the government's submission indicating that the defendant has ongoing connections or communications or relationships with Colombo family members. And obviously, then, I heard a reference just a few minutes ago from Ms. Gedz about that.

So I want to hear if the government has any information about those connections or this phone call that was referenced a minute ago.

Hold your thought. Let me first hear from Mr.

Pappa's lawyers.

MR. HOPWOOD: Good morning, Your Honor.

I'm going to address the eligibility portion of the argument. My colleague is going to address the 3553(a) factors. There are a couple of changes in the law that I want to highlight, one of which we did not brief.

When the sentencing commission changed the guidelines last year, they expanded compassionate release, just as Congress did through the First Step Act, and that created a bunch of new grounds. One of the things that they explained was that with the other reasons provisions, they have commentary in the guidelines. And it notes that while the guideline says similar in gravity, it rejected that it be similar in kind to age, medical, family, and the new ground of victim of some sexual assault in federal prison. It doesn't have to be similar in kind. It just has to be similar in gravity. I wanted to highlight that.

The commission also gave as an example in its commentary that an individual could raise youth at the time of the offense and rehabilitation and that could constitute extraordinary and compelling circumstances.

THE COURT: Mr. Hopwood, the same caution to you.

Go a little slower. Rest assured, I've looked at Amendment

804 in the appendix. I'm aware of what you're speaking about.

Go ahead.

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

19

There's another change of law that MR. HOPWOOD: happened last week, April 17th. The sentencing commission amended Section 5H1.1 on age, and now the guidelines are going to permit judges to depart downward based on age in light of today's retro understanding of brain science and neuroscience surrounding youthful offenders.

So the commission has been quite clear that both youth at the time of the offense can be an extraordinary compelling circumstance, and now they've even made clear that when you do initial sentencing hearings, you have the ability to take age at the time of the offense into the calculation.

We're relying primarily on Section B5, the other reasons provision, and asking that the Court take that into consideration. We've just heard testimony here today about who John Pappa was when he committed the offense.

THE COURT: Or statements, not testimony.

MR. HOPWOOD: Yes. I think what the Court has to understand is the brain and neuroscience behind that. We don't make light of the crimes he committed. We can't.

We understand the seriousness. If you look at the brain science, you understand, especially a young man in the 18 to 22 year old range, and he was 19 at the time of the offense, we have a greater understanding of why those things occurred, especially in an environment like Mr. Pappa was in.

His father had been murdered in part because he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

didn't carry out orders, and when he was given orders, given what we know about the brain science, it would have been very hard for somebody to say no in those circumstances, even though I think most people would be able to.

What Dr. Steinberg's declaration notes is that he meets all the qualifications of transient immaturity and heightened susceptibility to the influence of others. That would be even more so when you talk about the circumstances he was facing.

What's also important to note is, and this goes against some of the statements you just heard, his crimes do not reflect intractable bad character. We know that people People change, people in prison change, and he has set off on a different path for the last 27 years.

I want to talk a little bit about rehabilitation, because it's both a factor for extraordinary and compelling circumstances and goes to the heart of the 3553(a) factors. My colleague is going to largely address that issue. just say, we review lots of prison records and lots of cases in which we're trying to get letters from the Federal Bureau of Prisons employees who work with these people every day, and I think you can trust them over anybody here in the courtroom.

I think it's going to be a long time before you find a case with so many letters over such a long period of time, glowing letters of reference from people who have worked with

John and worked on his rehabilitation.

Lastly, I just want to talk about the unusually long sentence provision. I know that's a brand new provision.

Judges kind of haven't figured out how to directly apply that yet.

THE COURT: Can I tell you this, Mr. Hopwood, because I've had occasion to consider it in another case, and I don't ultimately think it applies to Mr. Pappa because the purpose of it is to allow for consideration of post sentencing changes in the law where there are unusually long sentences.

I guess what you're going to say is that somehow this recent change, 5H, is what you are relying on to make that applicable.

MR. HOPWOOD: That, and the Supreme Court's decisions in Roper and Graham and Miller that recognize that people that commit offenses at a young age are far less culpable than those of adults. We would rely on all those. All the forward movement towards recognizing that when people commit offenses at that age, it does not mean that they will forever be a bad person or a bad character. All the neuroscience tells us that.

So that would be one of the changes in law that we would rely on for B6.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HOPWOOD: Do you have any questions for me, Your

	Proceedings 22
1	Honor, on eligibility?
2	THE COURT: I do not. I certainly understand your
3	arguments and obviously they're based on various provisions
4	that are in a state of evolution. I do understand that.
5	MR. HOPWOOD: I'm going to let my colleague, Mr.
6	Singhal, address the 3553.
7	MR. SINGHAL: Thank you, Judge.
8	Picking up on rehabilitation, I just wanted to
9	highlight some short quotes from some of the letters. Officer
10	Werts writes: In my 22 years working for the Federal Bureau
11	of Prisons, I've only felt comfortable writing a character
12	letter for one other man besides Mr. Pappa. Officer Clemmons
13	writes: Despite Pappa's offenses, I would not hesitate to
14	employ him. His work ethic is the best.
15	THE COURT: You need to go slower, as well. And if
16	you'll do me a favor, I know the letters that you speak of,
17	but the spellings of the last names.
18	MR. SINGHAL: Yes, Your Honor. Officer Werts was
19	W-E-R-T-S.
20	THE COURT: And Clemmons is?
21	MR. SINGHAL: C-L-E-M-M-O-N-S. These are cited in
22	our initial brief, docket 238, at page 18.
23	THE COURT: I see all of them. I'm looking at
24	Exhibit C of your appendix.

MR. SINGHAL: And then Officer Joseph, J-O-S-E-P-H,

writes, I've work with thousands of inmates in 22 years, but there are four incredible gentlemen that work side by side with me through those years and Mr. Pappa was one of those four.

I would also highlight in our second supplement, the appendix to what I believe is docket 244, attachment B, Officer Green writes: During the ten years that -- that's G-R-E-E-N -- during the ten years that I have been employed by the BOP, this is my first letter in support of a reduction of sentence. There is no person more deserving of a second chance. He always tells other inmates --

THE COURT: Hold on. You have to go a little slower.

There's no person more deserving of a second chance. Go ahead. I have observed Mr. Pappa, that's where you're reading from, right?

MR. SINGHAL: I have an ellipsis in there. And then later on: He always tell other inmates, quote, this is a rehearsal. If you don't change now, you won't be successful upon release. I can honestly say that Mr. Pappa's transformation is authentic.

Again, that's obviously difficult to reconcile with the statements you've heard today, but you'll hear from Mr. Pappa, as well. And in the cases we've cited in our briefing, courts have credited defendants with impressive rehabilitation

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

## Proceedings

where they have completed hundreds of hours of programming or dozens of courses, and Mr. Pappa has completed thousands of hours of programming and hundreds of courses.

And what I would note is that he's done all this, this education, this self correction, this transformation that strong evidence indicates is authentic when he lacked any real expectation or hope that today would come, when he lacked any hope that we would have a First Step Act that permits him to ask this Court to take that second look that Congress and the Sentencing Commission envisioned would suitably replace parole.

And other Courts have agreed, Judge Gershon, Lugo, that such behavior is especially significant for those reasons. Also, the Reynolds case, and Your Honor also in Rocky Freeman, looked to his record of rehabilitation and we would submit that Mr. Pappa's record is at least as impressive as that one was.

THE COURT: For the record, just so it's clear though, Mr. Freeman's case didn't involve multiple murders. So it was really quite different.

MR. SINGHAL: I'll talk about the circumstances in the A1 sentencing factor in a moment. As Your Honor knows, he has a release plan to go to South Carolina. He would intend to stay there. He intends to never come back to New York. On that note, I would mention his sister, Christina, is here from

Nicole Sestá, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

England. His mother and father are here from South Carolina. His mother is 76 now, as she wrote in her letter, and her one wish is for her son to come home.

Turning to the 3553(a) factors, I won't go through each one, but the nature and circumstances of the offense, all lives may have equal value but it does not follow that all murders have equal gravity. I think we as a society recognize that certain murders are worse; murder of a child, murder of a law enforcement officer, murder entwined with rape.

And even in the context of multiple murders, some are worse; murders ordered by a gang leader, shooting sprees of innocents, terrorism. The factors around Mr. Pappa's upbringing and his being preconditioned to impress his superiors, the fact that he was recruited to murder Scopo, he was not the leader. With Sparacino he did not fire the shot. That was his codefendant, according to paragraph 35 of the PSR.

With Rivera he was recruited by Curcio. Those facts weigh against imposition of the most severe term of imprisonment. Looking at the cases, the overwhelming force of the rulings under the First Step Act, is a sentence closer to 30 years is appropriate in a case like this.

There are other cases that involve multiple murders.

Tellier involved four murders, and that case did not have youth as a factor.

THE COURT: Go back for a moment. It was Tellier.

MR. SINGHAL: T-E-L-L-I-E-R. Both Chan and Cheng, the Green Dragon cases that Judge Dearie ruled on, involved multiple brutal murders. In Cheng, the defendant raped one of two robbery victims and was granted time served after approximately 31 years.

THE COURT: Pausing. C-H-E-N-G.

MR. SINGHAL: Sorry, Your Honor. Chan was C-H-A-N. In the Chan case, there were three murders and Judge Dearie said life without parole is quote utterly inconsistent with the goals of criminal sentencing. In the Cheng case, Judge Dearie wrote that a life sentence was quote far greater than necessary.

And so the question arises, is a life sentence necessary here. Certainly the man that Judge Dearie sentenced in this building 25 years ago deserved to go to prison. What he said then, I'd like to read a brief quote from that day, he said to Mr. Pappa: You are as an adult, even a young adult, responsible for your actions. But I have this abiding sense that that responsibility is shared. How the mind processes the influences and experiences of life, as I say, is beyond my capacity to fully understand. But in a case of this sort, one really has to wonder.

He then sentenced Mr. Pappa to die in prison. But the man who sits before you does not need to die there in

Nicole Sesta, RPF, RMF, CRR Officia, Court Reporter

order for Your Honor to accomplish the goals of Section 3553(a).

THE COURT: I want to just go back to something you said about Mr. Pappa's role with respect to each of these killings. I'm looking at the government's submission, or perhaps I could just let the government respond, but it seemed to me based on the descriptions provided by the government that Mr. Pappa was really behind the killing of Mr. Sparacino because he was upset that Mr. Sparacino was taking credit for the killing of Mr. Scopo, and that, quite honestly, all these murders seem to be driven in some way by Mr. Pappa's ambition or hubris or bravado, whatever you want to call it, his desire to advance his position within the Colombo family.

So your characterization now that somehow he was simply taking orders strikes me as contrary to the facts, at least as explained by the government. Perhaps I should let the government speak more directly to that.

MR. SINGHAL: May I respond to that briefly? THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. SINGHAL: I think we agree with the characterizations that the government made, and according to the PSR what you've stated about his motives and ambition are correct. We don't challenge that. We're not here to relitigate the facts.

Other Courts' rulings on these motions have looked,

## Proceedings

for example, to who played what role in the killing. And I was arguing simply that according to paragraph 35 of the PSR, it was Hennigar who shot Sparacino in the back of the head killing him. So I highlight that as a distinguishing factor.

The facts that you state about his motives and his ambitions, we both concede and we would argue are consistent with Dr. Steinberg's declaration that he was acting to impress his superiors.

THE COURT: All right. The one other thing I'll note, though, and I do want you to respond to this, the killing of Mr. Rivera struck me as so senseless, so beyond senseless in terms of concerns about indiscretion or perhaps disrespect. And all killings are senseless, obviously, at some level.

I guess what I'm grappling with is these killings seemed to be motivated by so little actual reason or rationality or purpose or justification, and that word I use very cautiously. But explain to me more. I understand the underdeveloped or less developed brain of a young person, and I understand that Mr. Pappa committed these crimes when he hadn't yet reached 20, I believe, but the thin, almost non-existent reason to commit these crimes based on some suspicion about people speaking about acts done by the defendant, things like that, how should I weigh that, in light of your argument that somehow he was too young to understand

Nicole Sestá, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

the gravity of what he was doing or the consequences of it for others?

MR. SINGHAL: I'd like to respond. I believe my colleague has a brief answer, as well, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. SINGHAL: I don't know that our argument is that he couldn't understand the consequences so much as that he couldn't say no, and the key fact is that he was recruited by Curcio to be part of the Curcio crew, as indicated in the PSR.

And when Curcio decided or agreed for senseless reasons to murder Rivera, yes, the PSR corroborates that Pappa did not object to going along with that. Pappa was provided a weapon and played his role.

But we would argue that he was 19 at the time of all four killings, and his ability to say no to his superiors was substantially diminished. That does not justify anything, but it makes it less culpable than a similar killing committed by someone who is older. My colleague has --

MR. HOPWOOD: Yes. Your Honor, on page 232 of the trial transcript, this did not come out in the presentence investigation report, but what did come out at the trial that he was actually ordered to kill Mr. Sparacino. That came out at the trial, page 232.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear from the government.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter Given that I had one submission and there were a number of subsequent submissions, I'm going to be giving a more fulsome, robust response to a number of things.

Your Honor, the defendant is not legally or factually deserving of compassionate release. His behavior was intentional, it was calculated, it was senseless, and that's only to speak of the murders. He additionally committed drug crimes out of greed and personal desire, all in an effort to get into or to impress, as the defense claims, the Colombo crime family.

His arguments do not collectively make out extraordinary and compelling reasons, nor do the 3553(a) factors warrant compassionate release.

Setting aside for the moment that the murders in aid of racketeering would statutorily still mandate a life sentence, that is if the government didn't seek the death penalty. The effect of the defendant's conduct, as the Court witnessed today in court, is still felt as if it happened yesterday for the family members.

It is confusing, it is emotional, the rage filled with a sadness, just utter sadness and devastation, that these family members will never see their loved one again, and the impact of the defendant's conduct not only profoundly affects the victims' families, but his own family as well.

So with that backdrop, Your Honor, I would like to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

first address the defendant's claim that he makes out extraordinary and compelling reasons that his upbringing and youth at the time of the offense make him less culpable.

The Court should reject this for a number of Factually speaking, the defendant's upbringing was far from what the cases they cite, the upbringings of those defendants. The defendant did have some hardships. his father, which he describes as very painful for him, but that was an involvement in the crime family.

The defendant learned and had a firsthand view of what involvement in organized crime could bring to his life. Nevertheless, he not only forged that voluntarily, he took his involvement and aspirations of involvement into his own hands, as most evidenced by the murder of Eric Curcio. ordered him to do that.

He argues that his father's death affected him in somewhat contrary and convenient ways. I don't dispute that it did have an affect on him, but on the one hand he claims that the stories, both the false and true stories, were the basis for his bullying and torment and just to validate the challenges he faced as a child.

On the other hand, he argues that hearing the real story about his father's death and the enduring pain of not having a father, ostensibly a reason to run away from a life of crime with organized crime, was a hardship on him growing

up.

Now, he tried to impress the very organization that took the life of his friends, his family members, and other people, particularly the lives that he took himself.

Now, he had a mother, he had a sister, he had a stepfather. His sister has accomplished great things. She's an attorney. She wrote a wonderful submission on his behalf, and her sentiments are completely understandable. But there was a way out for John Pappa, and that is evidenced by his sister's own accomplishments.

He had a home. He was raised in the suburbs of New Jersey. He had shelter. He had food. And as the presentence report details, one of the hardships he's faced was when his mother had to sell a home that she owned and they downsized to a smaller rental apartment, shelter nonetheless.

He did not come from a broken family. He still had his mother, he still has his sister. These I would not describe as a lack of resources.

Now, the cases that the defendant cites to speak about upbringing being a factor that Courts have considered in granting compassionate release also speak to age. I would like to speak about the defendant's age first, and then address the cases that have been cited.

The defendant was 19 years old and undoubtedly the defense has submitted copious amounts of data about how youth

affects crime and the brain functionality of someone of that age.

However, the defendant's crimes spanned five decades. Two years prior to his rash of murders, he was involved in the drug trade. He was about 17 years old when the conspiracy and the distribution charge began. Then at 19 he committed four heinous and senseless murders.

THE COURT: You don't mean decades, you mean years.

MS. BELIZAIRE: I'm sorry. Five years, Your Honor. Half of a -- sorry, five years.

THE COURT: Understood.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Half of a decade.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. BELIZAIRE: The defendant continued to sell drugs until he was 23, and in the midst of that he was also convicted of attempted criminal possession of a weapon in the third degree at 20 years old. So he lived a five-year span of committing crimes and injecting dangerous drugs into the community.

Turning now to the cases cited by the defense to support the proposition that youth and upbringing are factors this Court should consider, those cases are all incredibly distinguishable. Starting with *USA versus Chan*. Chan was completely unsupervised as a youth. He was searching for things like food and shelter. He committed his crimes on the

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

order of days and months after his 18 birthday, setting him aside from his codefendants who got the privilege of being under the age of 18 and, therefore, not facing a life sentence.

Judge Dearie spoke of the injustice of that by having been days or months just beyond 18 having a disparate sentence. And so, the Court could understand why that distinction mattered for Judge Dearie in sentencing Defendant Chan.

The defendant, on the other hand, was supervised.

He did have shelter, he did have a family. He has a family who loves him to this day, as they're present in the courtroom. He had no excuse for turning to the wrong people.

Turning to *USA versus Cheng*, who was the codefendant of Chan, that is also distinguishable. That defendant immigrated to the United States from Taiwan at age 14. Once he was here, he experienced a difficult adolescence dealing with poverty, absent parents, and physical abuse at the hands of his stepfather. He dropped out of school at age eight, and by his late teens he was effectively living on his own in homes of various friends in Flushing, New York.

The Court noted that the combined influence of obedience, survival, and reputation, survival being the operative word, were part of the totality of the circumstance why even though Cheng was older deserved the benefit of

compassionate release.

And so the sentencing disparities between codefendants in a singular case is what Judge Dearie was really grappling with.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. It's also true that Cheng's crimes, as horrific as they were, I think he was a person who drove others to commit murders, is that right, and then did rape one of the victims of robbery, right?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. Yes. That was a distinction that the Court made, that while all of the conduct was horrible and indefensible, he did play a role of being the driver to the murders.

And most importantly, I'd like to talk about acceptance of responsibility and remorse. In a number of these cases, and I'll point them out one by one, but Defendant Cheng, the Court noted, accepted full responsibility for his crimes. He recognized they were serious and he offered genuine remorse.

Cheng said that it was wrong to have joined the gang and to have caused the horrific deaths of the victims. He called himself the worst of criminals and feels shameful about himself. He sees that his loss of liberty cannot stand next to the murder victims and the suffering of their families.

He continues. Cheng's past deeds were nothing short of heinous, atrocious, and cruel. For every wrongdoing he

cannot turn his back on, Cheng is deeply remorseful, repentant of what he has done, and he understands the need to condemn them in the strongest of terms.

Now, other defendants in *USA versus Glynn*, *USA versus Glynn* also renounced his membership and is living in a dropout unit in the court. And also, in *USA versus Chan*, there was -- he further expressed remorse in a way that was very profound. The defendant's letter to the Court in the first submission does --

THE COURT: Now you're talking about Mr. Pappa?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. Defendant Pappa
does write a letter to the Court and he explains how he's a
changed man. But what is absent from that submission is a
true sympathy and a true remorse and a true negation of his
involvement with the Colombo crime family, or his aspirations
of becoming a member of the Colombo crime family.

What struck me about Defendant Pappa's letter is that he put "my" in quotes. He talks about my actions in quotes, and that undermines the very acceptance that he claims to be taking. Like he is both asking the Court to recognize how he's changed, and yet he -- and that he's taken responsibility for his actions, but it's undermined by putting "my" in quotes.

THE COURT: I mean, couldn't the opposite be said, which is he's not blaming his involvement with the Colombo

family or taking direction from others for his bad acts, but rather saying it was his bad acts?

Couldn't one argue that he's actually trying to accept responsibility as an individual versus a member of a mob family?

MS. BELIZAIRE: I think he is. I'm just noting that it's diluted by the quotes around the word "my". What the quotes do is show that it is not mine. That's when people use quotes is to say supposedly it is mine.

THE COURT: I see what you're saying.

MS. BELIZAIRE: So it dilutes the effect. The letter goes on to talk about his own victimization. He, I think at two junctures, speaks about how he can't believe he did what he did, but as opposed to the other defendants who were deserving of compassionate release, their profound remorse is felt. It is palpable through the words that they use in describing the conduct that they committed.

And so I think that that's another reason the cases are distinguishable from the defendant. The upbringing, the age, and the lack of remorse are all distinguishable. I'll note *USA versus Haynes* where the defendant was 23 really had nothing to do with his age. That had to do with the stacking of 924(c) in a spree of robberies.

So that case is in opposite when talking about age.

The defendant also fails to make out extraordinary and

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

compelling reasons by arguing that his sentence will amount to an unusually long sentence and will result in disparities when compared against other sentences; and by arguing that this Court could not consider mitigating circumstances of Pappa's youth and the impact on his family's involvement in organized crime at sentencing because the guidelines were then mandatory.

The Court should reject that for a number of reasons. Primarily, as I started out by saying, the defendant would still be facing two mandatory life prison sentences had he been sentenced today. Under the guidelines, now responding to the other reasons, argument put forth by defense today and in one of their more recent submissions, the defendant argues the psychology and the brain science, but then cites to the very cases that we've already discussed as how Courts have taken into account youth and age. Those are distinguishable.

Again, the guidelines, while no longer mandatory, it would be an academic conversation given that he would have faced two mandatory life sentences.

Now, the defendant was convicted of racketeering, racketeering conspiracy, two counts of murder in aid of racketeering, two counts of conspiracy to commit murder in aid of racketeering, possession of a firearm during a crime of violence, and conspiracy and the underlying distribution and possession with the intent to distribute narcotics. His

guideline calculations would be the exact same today as they were on the day he was sentenced.

Any judge in this courthouse would be well within their rights to sentence him to life in prison under the guidelines, having taken into account his age and his upbringing.

THE COURT: Right. I think the argument is that now the guidelines are advisory and then they were quote unquote mandatory, even though judges could depart under them but they had to find and explain reasons for doing so. I think that's the import of the defendant's argument about then and now, which is that judges have been given more authority or greater discretion to vary downward or depart, even if you want to call it that, from the guidelines because they're simply advisory and not truly mandatory.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Understood. However, the guidelines still require that the Court take into account a number of factors, and those factors which dovetail with the 3553(a) factors would still militate today for a life sentence, even though the guidelines are advisory.

And, again, that's having already been sentenced to two mandatory life in prison sentences. There have been countless cases in this courthouse where Courts today sentence defendants to life in prison. Most recently in the *United States versus Amador-Rios*, the defendant was convicted of one

completed murder, one attempted murder, for having been the leader of a gang, Melvi Amador-Rios, and he was sentenced to life in prison.

THE COURT: Oh, maybe Amador-Rios, but his codefendant, Mr. Rivas was only sentenced to 35 years by virtue of 11(c)(1)(C).

MS. BELIZAIRE: Right. I'll speak to the point of pleading guilty before a trial. The defendant points to the disparities among his codefendants who were either involved or implicated in the death of Joe Scopo. Pleading guilty does come with benefits because it doesn't put family members through the rigors of trial.

It doesn't put witnesses through the rigors of trial and, therefore, there is a benefit to pleading guilty, in addition to not putting victims and witnesses on trial to be cross-examined, to be inconvenienced in life, and to relive the trauma they have already felt by the crime.

It's an economy of resources to plead guilty. Now, starting with Michael Persico, who got 60 years in prison, he was, apparently, only involved in one murder. Anthony Russo cooperated with the government. There could not be a more profound renouncement of organized crime than cooperating with the government. They face retaliation and even death for having done so. So yes, you do get a benefit when you cooperate with the government. And Theodore Persico was also

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

1 | involved in only one or two murders.

Now, the defendant, of course, was involved in four, and I'd like to address the 3553(a) factors in terms of the nature and circumstances of his crime and history.

To answer the Court's question from earlier about his involvement or his association with crime family members, the government submitted some Bureau of Prison records, and found that there are people contributing money to his commissary as recently as 2023, who are still associated with crime families; not just Colombo, but other crime families as well.

I'll start with Carmella Sessa. As recently as

January 12, 2023, and on three days thereafter, that's

December of 2022, Carmella Sessa contributed almost \$1,000 to the defendant.

THE COURT: Hold on. Is it C-E-S-S-A?

MS. BELIZAIRE: It's S-E-S-A, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm trying to look at the record you provided.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. I can point you to the page numbers.

THE COURT: I see it now. I just didn't know who was who, so I wasn't quite sure which individuals you were focused on.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. There are about

seven individuals I'll walk the Court through who have involvement in the crime families.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Carmella Sessa is the wife of a defendant prosecuted in this courthouse by the name of Ilario Sessa. His alias was Fat Larry. He is a made soldier of the Colombo crime family. Sessa had his first conviction in 1994 when he was convicted of conspiracy to distribute narcotics and conspiracy to defraud the United States. I can give the Court docket cites, if that's helpful.

THE COURT: You need not do that.

MS. BELIZAIRE: He was released in 2009 and was shortly thereafter arrested again for violation of his supervised release related to his continued violation of the non-association clause concerning members of organized crime.

In 2011, Sessa was again indicted as a Colombo family associate and ultimately convicted of racketeering conspiracy, including extortion collection of credit and conspiracy and possession of a firearm.

Following Sessa's release from prison, he was again arrested on a violation of a supervised release in and around 2019. This could not show a clearer association with a crime family. These are the people who are giving the defendant money while he's in prison. So the next is Frank Schwamborn.

THE COURT: Spell that one.

	Proceedings 43
1	MS. BELIZAIRE: S-C-H-W-A-M-B-O-R-N.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MS. BELIZAIRE: On six different occasions between
4	2018 and 2021, the Schwamborns, Frank Schwamborn and Joanne
5	Schwamborn, collectively sent the defendant \$2,200 while in
6	prison. Frank Schwamborn is a convicted associate of the
7	Genovese crime family, and in 2002 he pled guilty to
8	racketeering, racketeering conspiracy, wire fraud, wire fraud
9	conspiracy, conspiracy to collect unlawful debts, and
10	interstate transportation of stolen checks.
11	So yet another member who is contributing to the
12	defendant's commissary, still a member of the Colombo crime
13	family I'm sorry Genovese crime family.
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MS. BELIZAIRE: On the defendant's contact list are
16	a number of players known to also be in organized crime.
17	Frank BF Guerra is listed in his contacts as a friend who he
18	can have email, phone, and mail communications with.
19	THE COURT: Okay, spell that.
20	MS. BELIZAIRE: G-U-E-R-R-A.
21	THE COURT: I see.
22	MS. BELIZAIRE: And that phone list creation is
23	dated October of 2009 and was last changed September of 2011.
24	THE COURT: Okay.
25	MS. BELIZAIRE: Frank Guerra is a convicted Colombo

associate and was inducted or became a made member after serving jail in about 2021.

In 2013, Guerra went on trial for two murders involving -- including an involvement in the murder of Joe Scopo. Though he beat those murder charges, he was convicted of a drug conspiracy. During his sentence Judge Townes found that the government proved by clear and convincing evidence that Guerra committed the murder of Scopo.

Now, I would like to contextualize the murder of Joseph Scopo. Joseph Scopo was an acting crime boss in a faction of the Colombo family. Many people wanted to murder Joe Scopo and, in fact, many people were involved in his murder. The defendant happened to be one of the crew members on the hit team who had the guns that actually gunned down Joe Scopo.

So when this Court hears that various people were convicted or involved in the murders of Joe Scopo, it's because it was such a collective effort by the faction that the defendant was loyal to that carried out that murder that many people are, in fact, responsible for that.

THE COURT: Can I ask you a question? In your own letter you say it was the defendant who immediately pursued Scopo, striking him three times with gunfire, once fatally.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes. He was actually the man, the foot soldier on the ground with the gun gunning down Joseph

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

#### 45 **Proceedings** The defendant is responsible for having killed him. 1 Scopo. 2 THE COURT: And Judge Townes' finding with respect 3 to Guerra is that he was part of the same crew that was 4 hunting down Mr. Scopo? 5 MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Understood. 6 7 MS. BELIZAIRE: George Zappola, whose nickname is 8 George Neck. 9 THE COURT: Spell that. 10 MS. BELIZAIRE: Z-A-P-P-O-L-A. THE COURT: 11 Okay. 12 MS. BELIZAIRE: He's listed as a friend with whom 13 the defendant can have phone and mail communications. 14 was created on November 12th of 2019. He's a convicted Lucchese captain, who pled guilty 15 in 1996 to numerous counts, including racketeering, 16 racketeering conspiracy, multiple counts of conspiracy to 17 18 murder, two counts of murder accessory after the fact, 19 concealing person from arrest, and conspiracy to defraud the 20 United States. He was sentenced to 22 years. I'll mention 21 three additional names. 22 THE COURT: Is Zappola in jail now? When was that 23 sentence? 24 MS. BELIZAIRE: He is out. It was 22 years in 1995. 25 THE COURT: So hence the November 2019 contact

	Proceedings 46
1	creation?
2	MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Got it.
4	MS. BELIZAIRE: Anthony Loffredo, L-O-F-F-R-E-D-O,
5	and his wife, Ms. Loffredo, are listed as friends from whom he
6	can receive mail.
7	Anthony Loffredo, also known as Tony Bones, is a
8	convicted Lucchese associate, including a murder conviction.
9	He pled guilty to racketeering in 2000, and was sentenced to
10	252 months.
11	THE COURT: So he's in jail?
12	MS. BELIZAIRE: He apparently just was released last
13	year. He was also inducted into the Lucchese family.
14	THE COURT: When was that contact established?
15	MS. BELIZAIRE: I don't have the benefit of that,
16	Your Honor. Some of the contacts don't if you do a control
17	find don't all have dates when they were updated, though
18	where I've told the Court the records do reflect.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	MS. BELIZAIRE: Finally, not finally, two more.
21	Joseph Savarese, S-A-V-A-R-E-S-E, whose nickname is Joe Saf is
22	also listed as a friend from whom he can receive mail. There
23	is no date associated with that contact.
24	He is a convicted Colombo soldier, and in 1996 he
25	pled guilty to racketeering. He was sentenced to 174 months.

In 2012 he pled guilty to racketeering conspiracy and received a sentence of 125 months. He is also out of jail.

And then, finally, Joe Chilli, C-H-I-L-I, and his wife, Rose Chilli, also not dated, though they are listed as friends from whom he can receive mail. Joe Chilli is a convicted Bonanno soldier.

THE COURT: Do you have a date of that contact being established?

MS. BELIZAIRE: I don't, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Joe Chilli pled guilty to conspiracy to distribute and possessed one kilogram or more of a substance containing heroin, and five kilograms or more of a substance containing cocaine back in 2000. The Chillis are a multigenerational family of Bonannos.

So at first glance the defendant has a number of contacts throughout the course of his time in prison where he has not rejected or renounced associations with people who are affiliated with crime families.

That also distinguishes him from the defendants who expressed remorse and who are in dropout units and who have renounced their gang affiliation.

Now, turning to the 3553(a) factors. This defendant committed four murders, which is one of the most serious federal crimes that a person can commit.

He was not being recruited. He was ordered to kill Joe Scopo, but the other murders, as the Court has pointed out, seem to be on his own volition to get credit for the murder of Joe Scopo. It is greed, it is ambition, it is hubris, and that is why three additional people were murdered.

Not only were they murdered, they were degraded.

Rolando Rivera had the misfortune of being friends with John Sparacino and the misfortune of having too much information. Those trivial triggers are what caused the defendant and another to take him from his home, shoot him in a car, push him out of a moving van leaving him alive, undoubtedly a terrible way to suffer.

He hadn't yet succumbed to those gunshot wounds, and police found him alive. He suffered until he was found by the police and he suffered until he died. You heard from Ms. Gedz today. She is absolutely devastated by this. I don't need to recount that. You got to see it firsthand, and I appreciate the Court's indulgence in hearing that. But her trauma is still felt today, every single day she is alive.

THE COURT: Let me pause you for one second and check with our court reporter.

(Pause.)

MS. BELIZAIRE: John Sparacino, his murder was equally egregious, all because the defendant wanted credit for murdering Scopo. And the irony of wanting compassion when at

Nicole Sestá, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## **Proceedings**

the time murders were not a result of not only a lack of compassionate, but greed and credit, a desire for credit for a And the messaging surrounding John Sparacino's murder was truly outrageous. It was not enough to kill him, but he was hogtied, mutilated, a flap of skin was cut off of his face and, of course, the most degrading fact, as the Court knows, his penis was chopped off and put into his mouth, because death wasn't enough for John Sparacino. The family members have pain and suffering, again as this Court witnessed in this courtroom today.

The 3553(a) factors do not militate towards a compassionate release. The defendant committed more murders than any of the cases cited, and murderers in this courthouse routinely get multiple life sentences, in large part to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment, and to afford adequate deterrence to others and to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant.

The victims live in fear that this defendant will get out and exact retribution against them for having come here today to speak to this Court about how his crimes have impacted them.

That is also palpable, and was felt in this courtroom today. They will never get any relief. They will never have peace of mind. They will never share a holiday with their loved one. And so a sentence -- the sentences that

49

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

were imposed on the defendant when he was sentenced are still appropriate today.

I believe that addresses all the arguments. I'm happy to answer any questions the Court has.

THE COURT: No. That was certainly sufficient and filled in some blanks with respect to the alleged connections. There is one other question about the phone call that Ms. Gedz referred to. What, if anything, have you determined about that?

MS. BELIZAIRE: My understanding is that is a phone call that she received back before she testified, and it was in an effort to intimidate her and dissuade her from coming to court to testify against the defendant.

THE COURT: Was the government able to determine who made the call?

MS. GEDZ: Yes. Sorry.

MS. BELIZAIRE: No one was ever arrested in connection with that call. I think it was once removed, and given that the defendant -- I think ultimately the caller, as I understand it from Ms. Gedz, is that it was someone who was told by someone else to call her to convince her to not come.

THE COURT: Again, this is back in 1994?

MS. GEDZ: 1997. No, 1999, before the trial.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. That clears that up.

Thank you. Let me hear from the defense. These ongoing

Nicole Sesta, RPF, RMF, CRR Official Courl Reporter

connections or receipts of money with convicted and known crime family members is something I want to understand better.

MR. HOPWOOD: Okay. Well, Your Honor, first, I want to address one quick fact about Mr. Pappa's upbringing. His father was murdered at five. His stepfather was arrested. They actually lost that house. And so while the upbringing may be slightly better than in those other cases, it's still not like this was a good family dynamic.

And the fact that his sister has gone on to become a lawyer just shows you that two kids in trauma can have different responses, and that's what we would say to this.

THE COURT: Let's go back, though, to that. The government's point is that -- I mean the trauma he suffered was his father being killed, but his father was killed by the organization that he then so eagerly wanted to join. Can you explain that?

MR. HOPWOOD: Young men are not rational, Your Honor. That's probably the best explanation for it in a nutshell. He saw that, was traumatized by it, and some people run from that, like his sister did, and some people run into it. It's perfectly consistent with Dr. Steinberg's declaration on the brain science around that.

The government was parsing Mr. Pappa's letter about remorse. What I want to tell you about the remorse is, don't look at his letter. Look at his actions. He is a victim

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

impact facilitator at the prisons he's been at, trying to help people like him have self-reflection on the harm they've caused and how they can repair that harm, and he has gone about trying to do everything he could. The reason you see all those letters from BOP officials is because John Pappa is well known in the federal system for doing re-entry work and doing rehabilitation work with other prisoners. He's a leader on this. He's well known within the system.

As to these people that he has been communicating with, a lot of those names are people that John has served time with in other prisons and has remained in communication with. One of the names that we noticed off the list was a client of ours, Adam Clausen, who was serving a 213 year prison sentence, was granted compassionate release. He and John did re-entry work together at a prison and now Mr. Clausen is out in Las Vegas doing re-entry work for the Nevada State Department of Corrections. And so John has remained in contact with people that he has done this re-entry work with.

As for Mr. Sessa, John says that is a friend of his father's who he's never spoken to, but this man sends him money every Christmas. John doesn't know why, but it's not somebody he's in constant communication with. Most of the other names on there that they list were people that John has done re-entry work or served time with.

THE COURT: Hang on a second. Let's go back for a

want to extend an apology to the family members of the victims

for, in effect, re-traumatizing you by having this hearing. I hope you understand that because I was not involved in the original proceedings and only recently was assigned to this matter, that it felt important for me to be able to see and hear from everyone who has such a strong interest in this case.

That's why I'm holding the proceeding and giving everyone an opportunity to speak, and be heard and also seen. I realize that there are consequences to that, and for that I do apologize.

So I made that comment, I'll just note, without the defendant being present. I don't think that that's relevant. Let me hear from the petitioner's lawyers on these alleged ongoing contacts with members of crime families.

MR. HOPWOOD: So it is not uncommon for people to serve time together and then when one person is released to send money back to their friends. That is a very common thing within the Federal Bureau of Prisons. A lot of that is what's going on here, Your Honor.

George Zappola was someone that Mr. Pappa served time with in Allenwood. Frank Schwamborn was someone that he served time with in Allenwood and who has sent Mr. Pappa some money. Joe Chilli is someone that Mr. Pappa served time with at Edgefield. Anthony Loffredo, he served time with at BOP at MDC Brooklyn, and Joseph Savarese sent Mr. Pappa a picture and

## Proceedings

it was denied by the Bureau of Prisons, and he has not had any communication with him. This does not speak to ties to organized crime more than it does friendships made with people inside the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Again, I guarantee you there are more people on that list that have felony convictions that are not tied to any organized crime members but that John remains in contact with because they served time together, and he did do some rehabilitation and re-entry work with a whole host of people who have now been released from prison. I want to call your attention to that, again.

He was a victim impact facilitator who quote:

Promotes acceptance of responsibility, genuine remorse,
empathy, and making amends. That is how Mr. Pappa has tried
to carry himself for the last 20 or so years.

He knows he can't go back and change the things that he did. So he has been trying to make sure that people that come out of Federal Bureau of Prisons don't go back to the life that they had before, and he is a leader on that issue. And I think given the BOP letters you have and his release plan, you can have a lot of assurance that when he's released he's going to South Carolina and he's going to continue to do this work.

THE COURT: Let's discuss in the broader point that the government is making with respect to these ongoing

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

contacts with individuals who have been convicted, and some pretty recently of criminal activity involving enterprises, such as the Colombo crime family and the Lucchese crime family.

The defendant hasn't, it appears, expressly disavowed, I guess, association with crime families or showing remorse for his own involvement, for his involvement with these crime families. Perhaps you can answer that question, or at least the government's argument or accusation in that regard.

MR. HOPWOOD: First, I'd point out that the government has had these motions now for 16 months. If there was some communication, all phone calls are recorded in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The mail is monitored, the email is monitored. If there was some sort of there there with respect to John facilitating with organized crime members, the government would have it and be presenting it to you.

THE COURT: I'm talking more about attitude and what you allege is a changed man.

MR. HOPWOOD: I think rather than having me answer that, Your Honor, at the end Mr. Pappa is going to address that. I don't think I can do it justice like he will be able to.

THE COURT: Is there anything else you wanted to say in response to the government's argument? Yes, Mr. Singhal.

## Proceedings

MR. SINGHAL: Sure. Briefly on the cases, I don't want to belabor the point, but Chan, that defendant did personally shoot, commit a murder, and Chan lost his father at 14. So he had at least more of a stable childhood and upbringing until that point. He also had an exceptionally poor record in the Bureau of Prisons, acted violently for the first decade, and that is documented in Judge Dearie's opinion.

Cheng, yes, was just the driver, but Judge Dearie rejected that as a reason to treat him as less culpable because he did it over and over again, knowing what was going on. That's also in that opinion, and Cheng was 20. Glynn was 22, and he was a Bloods leader. So he personally committed a murder, but also recruited others, provided the firearms, and as a leader, his life sentence was reduced to 35 years.

Finally, I'll note Ramirez, R-A-M-I-R-E-Z, Judge McMahon's opinion, that reduction was only from 48 to 40 years but that was also a leader that led a criminal organization for years, personally participated in two murders, and instructed another member of his organization to shoot and kill a rival drug dealer.

So we would say that some of these cases were arguably more serious facts in that the defendants were leaders of the organizations, at least as serious, and received relief comparable to the relief we're requesting.

We also note that Mr. Pappa has served the equivalent of approximately 32 years after factoring in the 45 day per year good time. So his 34 [sic] times .85 is I think 27.2. So that's in the range of the reduction, reduced sentences, that Courts seem to grant in circumstances that we argue are similar to these.

Finally, on the point about his letter, I think the government steps too far in trying to read the scare quotes as being scare quotes. Mr. Pappa teaches the importance of using "I" statements in his victim impact sessions. I honestly believe those are for emphasis, not to somehow undermine the idea he means my as my.

THE COURT: I'll hear from Mr. Pappa. Did the government want to say anything before I hear from the defendant?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. My apologies. I'd like to just address the rehabilitation, which I did not do at first.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. BELIZAIRE: Indeed it is something to be proud of, something that the defendant should put before this Court. However, it's not unique to the defendant. The cases cited by the defendant of individuals who are involved in organized crime all have robust efforts at rehabilitation while in custody.

So it is commendable and something that we should all as a society encourage, but it is not distinct as compared to other cases. I'd like to address this concept of having dual worlds or split personalities.

It's not something that's foreign to La Cosa Nostra, which is the collection of the crime families. In fact, the entire concept of the mob and the five families was to protect their community. But it was at a heavy, heavy cost. It was often at the cost of killings, of robberies, of extortion, and it was all premised, ostensibly, on helping and protecting their community. So this disjunct of helping and advancing the community is not at odds in this world with also committing serious, heinous crimes.

And that is something that's unique, I think, to organized crime families is this duality of doing good and also doing incredibly evil things. Another hallmark of the Colombo crime family and other crime families is death before dishonor. It is common for defendants who are aspiring made members of their respective families to do long prison sentences and be inducted thereafter.

Death before dishonor is the mantra that allows the defendants to hold strong to their family ties while incarcerated in the effort of being inducted while in jail or after they're released. That is true with some of the people on the defendant's contact list, as I listed earlier. And so

the defendant's lack of a disavow of his membership, or his allegiance, or his aspirations of being a member of the crime family is something that this Court should consider in the context of organized crime families.

THE COURT: Are you suggesting that there really is or that there's a real concern that Mr. Pappa is going to rejoin the Colombo crime family, or one of the LCN crime families if he's released from prison?

MS. BELIZAIRE: Yes, Your Honor. As evidenced by Frank Sessa's induction after his long incarceration, as evidenced Frank Guerra's induction after his long incarceration, and Larry Sessa's induction after incarceration, there is a reward for having served long prison sentences. That is not to make light of what the victims fear, and the fear that they've put on the record today.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HOPWOOD: Your Honor, may I respond?

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Hopwood.

MR. HOPWOOD: Your Honor, I don't think you have to fear him going back to organized crime. If he was going to do that, he would be doing that in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, rather than what he has been doing.

He's got 20 years of rather remarkable rehabilitation efforts pointing him in a completely different direction, and I think you can take confidence from those

letters from BOP folks. I don't think he snookered everyone at the Federal Bureau of Prisons into thinking that he is going back to a life of crime. He could very easily. It's very well known that people in organized crime, when they're in prison, remain in organized crime. There is no record that he's done that. Instead, his record is the opposite.

THE COURT: I guess, at least to paraphrase what the government is arguing and certainly some of the victims' family members are saying, is that perhaps he's smart enough to realize that he'll get out sooner if he convinces everyone that he's seen the light. I guess if one were to be cynical, the reason to do that when you're in jail on a life sentence, because obviously, as you mentioned at the outset, contrary or despite the fact that he's been sentenced to die in prison, he's embarked on this remarkable effort at rehabilitation.

The flip side of that, one could say, the more cynical view of that is that it's a calculated way of trying to get out of prison or maintain some potential to get out of prison to rejoin and restart his life of crime. That certainly seems to be the government's argument, to some extent, and obviously the fear of the victim's families.

MR. HOPWOOD: Yes, but prior to 2018 there was no light at the end of the tunnel. And actually prior to 2020 when this Court and Courts in the Southern District of New York started granting compassionate release cases for people

who had committed murders, there was no view, rational view from him, that anything he was doing was going to lead to early release. So he was doing it for the right reasons.

THE COURT: Actually, let me turn back to the government. I mean, obviously, I could debate this myself, but I am curious about the government's response on that.

You're right that obviously there's a history of mob members counting on serving their time and then becoming made members once they get out, you know, for standing firm and not snitching and doing all the things they're supposed to or expected of them as crime family members.

But this is a situation where the defendant had no reasonable hope of ever getting out of prison and rejoining any of the families because he had been sentenced to multiple, not just one, but multiple life sentences. So isn't the more logical inference that he's actually genuinely seen the light and tried to make amends while in prison, even if for the rest of his life?

MS. BELIZAIRE: I don't know that I would characterize that as making amends. I think that might be turning a page for himself. But what I think is more profound is the lack of what seems to be, and of course we'll hear from him momentarily, the lack of remorse for the carnage that he left behind. You can turn a new page in prison and do good things for yourself and to better the community that you're

## Proceedings

in, not dissimilar to having done so in the outside world. But there, at least from the government's vantage point, has been very little in the way of addressing the carnage that he left behind. I think it's a productive use of his time and it's commendable, but I think it is not a persuasive point to me, to the government at least, that he has made amends, to use the Court's words, for the crimes he has committed.

THE COURT: That he's actually made amends or that his purpose is to make amends, his goal is to make amends? Those are two different things. Are you saying you don't think he's actually done any good, or you're saying his motivation is not to do good for others but simply to make his circumstances, be that a life sentence in prison better?

MS. BELIZAIRE: The latter, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I understand. Thank you. Mr. Pappa, I'm going to allow you to make a statement at this time, as well. Take your time.

THE DEFENDANT: First, Your Honor, I renounce all crime and --

THE COURT: Keep your voice up, please.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. First, I want to thank God and thank you for this opportunity. I'm gracious beyond belief. I've spent my 20s, my 30s, and my 40s continuously conducting self examinations, and I've fully come to understand why I did what I did and why I'll never in life do

Nicole Sesta, RPK, RMK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

#### 64 **Proceedings** 1 it again. 2 THE COURT: Tell me why. 3 THE DEFENDANT: As I grew up, this was all I knew. 4 And the government pointed out, they had said -- she had said 5 that why -- I said with my father and I couldn't believe that 6 I got to the point where I thought it was okay to do these 7 That was when everything dawned on me. I never 8 stopped to think. When I was brought up, everything was 9 victim blaming. 10 I accepted my father's death as something that could be normal. People told me your father died because he did the 11 12 He was such a great man and such a wonderful wrong thing. 13 man. So that's what I believed. 14 THE COURT: Sorry to interrupt you, again. Why join the organization that killed your father? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Because I thought I was going to do 17 this better than my dad and that's what I was supposed to do 18 and that's what I was in line to do. 19 You get your beliefs from what people tell you, and 20 from what you hear, see, and think is expected of you. And 21 that's what I did. I believe wholeheartedly that this was 22 expected of me. 23 THE COURT: What was expected of you?

THE DEFENDANT: To follow in my father's footsteps, to get into crime and do these things, and that's what I did.

24

After my father died, I don't like to bring this up, I never got to hear what really happened with my dad as a kid. I learned about it from people outside my household because my mother wanted to shelter us from that. So everything I ever learned and heard was glorification of my father.

The prosecutor is right in the sense that I had an okay life between my father's death and up until the time when we literally lost our home. Everything caved in at that time. When my mother remarried, I wanted nothing to do with my stepfather at that time. So I think my sister put it best, all the male role models that I had and the people who I respected were people who were my father's ilk. I did want to be like my father, 100 percent, with all my heart.

And prison is when, as I told you in the letter, when I rediscovered my humanity. Teaching the victim impact and doing the Challenge Program were actually stigmas in the penitentiary. It was frowned upon. People looked at you like you're going in the Challenge Program. And when I went in the Challenge Program, I had no reason at all to go into the Challenge Program. I stayed in the Challenge Program after I got there as a mentor.

THE COURT: Why did you go into the program then?

THE DEFENDANT: Originally because one of the facilitators, they were starting new, they needed people, and they knew I taught classes and did classes in the gym. So

they said why don't you come over here, we think you could be an asset and be good in the unit. I really didn't want to go because at the time I actually was happy in my unit.

I said you know what, let me try it. I'm going to go and check it out. When I went in there, I touched on a lot of this in my letter to you, when I went in there there was a lot of people who couldn't read. They had a really hard time reading. So I got involved with helping them understand the concepts, and it became rewarding. I really felt like I found myself.

But my transformation started way before then. It started when I ended up getting a letter, and the person who wrote me the letter, they started writing me. I don't know who it was. It's probably on that contact list somewhere. I wrote back and forth to this person. It was a girl, probably in the early 2000s. She was kissing the envelope and back then people sprayed perfume, and out of nowhere I got a question that said, don't you ever feel bad about what you did.

At that time I was hoping that I could find some newly discovered evidence, and I wrote back. I said I can't feel bad about what I did because -- I mean I can't feel bad about that because I didn't do it. I didn't do these things. But that letter weighed on me because I got a response, and the response was, basically, I can't believe that you don't

feel bad about what you did.

That was the first time that it was in my head that I made other people feel the exact same way that I felt with regard to my father's death, and how I made my sister feel, how my sister felt and my mother felt, and how it ruined their lives. I know I ruined their lives. I apologize to them from the bottom of my heart. That's when I had the epiphany. That's when it changed. That's when I felt horrendous. As I told you in the letter, I hit a point where I hated myself. I mean I hated myself.

That's why I feel their hate and I feel their pain now, and I understand it with all my heart. I vowed I was going to do everything in my power to change myself and became the person who I should have been. I committed myself every single day, every day I'm doing what I can to make amends. I made a conscientious decision to live differently, and that's what I'm doing. He had said it earlier, the guy that Judge Dearie sentenced deserved prison, belonged in prison for a long time. I know that.

When I made that decision it changed my life. I did everything that I possibly could. You won't find a guy with an organized crime case. I added up when I thought I was going to do this myself, this motion, and I added up five of the cases, Freeman, Russo, Monteleone, Tellier, Lugo, if you add up those five cases, the amount of programs that they did,

I have done more programs than they did in like a quarter of the time.

When we talk about rehabilitation, I've done this because this is it, this is real. I don't want to go to New York. I'm not going back to New York under no circumstances. I welcome the most stringent supervised release restrictions that there are.

I want to -- my friend, Adam, just sent me a letter. He was in prison too. He wrote a letter on my behalf to you. And he just sent me pictures from the anniversary for the First Step Act. He was in there with some senators and stuff. He said brother, I just can't wait for you to get home, he says, because we need you out here. I'm going to commit myself to helping kids, who are in the same -- growing up in the same situation as me.

This is emotional. I've learned my incarceration has been beneficial. It's been productive. It's been transformative. I've completely changed my way of thinking, my belief system. I've learned that working as hard as you possibly can, being honest and helping others, that those are the three keys to a meaningful life. I now see things clearly, act correctly, and my actions are positive, effective, and completely unselfish.

I just hope that you'll consider the changes that I made based on my actions, and not the words of these people.

#### 69 **Proceedings** I feel horrible for the last --1 2 MR. SPARACINO: And the Oscar goes to you. 3 MS. GEDZ: Exactly. 4 THE DEFENDANT: That I caused. MR. SPARACINO: I can't listen to this piece of 5 6 shit. 7 THE DEFENDANT: The victims and their families. if you find me worthy of some type of mercy, you have my word, 8 9 I'm going to spend the rest of my life proving myself to you, 10 to my family, and to my community. Whichever way this 11 decision goes today, I'll embrace it with willing acceptance 12 and I'll continue on my path that I've been on because I feel 13 good and I'm happy with who I am today. 14 Like I said, I do, I renounce all crime. I won't go near nothing. I don't want no part of anyone, no part of 15 16 anything. I've worked so hard at conquering my ego. are the things I work on to this day. There's only one word 17 18 that could come up in my mind right now, and that's I'm 19 grateful for this opportunity. I never foresaw this. And 20 just thank you and I'm sorry for it was so jumbled. 21 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pappa. Unless any of the 22 lawyers want to say anything further, as I said before, I'm 23 not sentencing or deciding on resentencing, I should say, Mr. 24 Pappa today. 25 So to be clear, I haven't decided whether or not I'm

#### 70 **Proceedings** going to grant the request for compassionate release and then 1 2 resentence him if I did. 3 I'm going to take this all under advisement. 4 appreciate everyone's thoughts and comments and certainly the statements from the family members, as well, and the statement 5 from Mr. Pappa. Does the government want to say anything 6 further? 7 8 MS. BELIZAIRE: Nothing further, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Hopwood or Mr. Singhal? 10 MR. HOPWOOD: No, Your Honor. No, Your Honor. 11 MR. SINGHAL: Thank you. 12 MS. BELIZAIRE: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 (Proceedings concluded at 12:15 p.m.) 15 16 17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 18 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 19 20 /S/ Nicole Sesta, RMR, CRR Court Reporter/Transcriber 21 22 April 25, 2024 Date 23 24 25